

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner has objected to claim 10 because Claim 10 requires the dispensing units to be linked. Linked to what? While Examiner has always assumed this means that the gaming machines were linked (thus linking the dispensing units), this no longer appears to be a reasonable interpretation. Claim 10 does not mention linked gaming machines and it would be reading too much into the claim to assume such a network. Nor does the claim indicate that there is a network of dispensing units. Also, the phrase, "that combination of devices" indicates a closer connection between devices than a network. In fact the language indicates that the combination becomes essentially one device. This is what Applicant describes in the specification when discussing how the dispenser may be mounted within the slot machine cabinet. Therefore, the Examiner will assume that the claim means that the dispensing units are linked to the gaming machines. Appropriate correction is required if Applicant wishes another interpretation.

Applicants has amended the claim to recite the language in the specification at page 8. The claim recites that the dispensing units are linked so that a combination of dispensing units has to have a certain number of coins inserted before a ticket is dispensed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 14-17 as being obvious over Okuniewicz, 6,585,589 in view of Quinn, 3,688,276.

**Claim 1:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz teaches devices for paying out a bonus (Col. 1 lines 43-46) to a player playing a gaming machine. (Fig. 1). There is a gaming machine (Slot Machine). There is a dispensing unit (Lottery Terminal). Since Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may dispense a ticket when a preset amount of coins are inserted (Col. 3 lines 46-53), there must be a numeric counter for counting the number of coins placed in said gaming machine that counts coins until a ticket is generated. Okuniewicz does not teach visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket or the number of coins inserted by the player. Nor does Okuniewicz teach resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. These are common functions on virtually any modern vending machine.

Quinn which is also a lottery ticket dispenser, teaches visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. (Fig. 1). Such a viable meter allows the player to know how much money he must insert and how much money he has inserted. Clearing the counter lets the player know that if he wants another ticket, he has to put in more money. These features add to user convenience and are, as previously pointed out, extremely well known. It would have been obvious to have modified Okuniewicz in view of Quinn to visually display to the player the number

of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as to reset the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated in order to add to player convenience.

Claim 1 requires a dispensing unit comprising a numeric counter for counting the number of coins placed in said gaming machine and **visually displaying to the player the number of coins**. The numeric counter counts coins until a ticket is generated. **The numeric counter resets the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. The dispensing unit further comprises a visual display showing a player number of coins needed to generate a ticket.** The dispensing unit has a ticket dispensing apparatus.

- The Examiner agrees that Okuniewicz does not
1. visually display to the user the number of coins placed in the gaming machine by the user.
  2. rest the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated.
  3. visually display to the user the number of coins needed to generate a ticket.

Okuniewicz states that the invention relates to a bonusing system which produces a bonus which is randomly generated and includes a bonusing factor beyond mere credits. Col. 1 lines 44-46. Okuniewicz teaches that a device detects electronically a certain event, and then based on the event supplies a lottery ticket from a lottery terminal. There is nothing in Okuniewicz that teaches visually showing a player when a lottery ticket will be generated. The

teachings of Okuniewicz teaches that the ticket be given out randomly based on certain events. The present invention teaches that a user stays on the gaming machine and plays the machine longer until the user sees that the amount of coins placed in the machine matches the number of coins needed to generate a ticket.

Further, Quinn only teaches putting money in a vending machine to buy a lottery ticket. There is nothing taught in Okuniewicz to combine the teachings. Further Okuniewicz teaches the dispensing of the tickets to be random, whereas Quinn teaches a lottery ticket is dispensed once the correct amount of money is paid for the ticket.

Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious based on Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claims 2-4:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may be a retrofit unit for a slot machine (Col. 3, lines 1-4). Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit could be attached to the gaming machine externally (i.e., side-mounted) or mounted internally. (Col 4, lines 63-66).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claims 2-4 are not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 5:** The Examiner states that the gaming machine may include video poker machines (Col. 3 lines 36-42). Video bingo games and video keno games are disclosed as equivalents.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 5 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 6:** The dispensing unit is a self-contained unit that does not affect the play or outcome of the gaming machine (Col 4 lines 35-43).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 6 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claims 9, 14:** Okuniewicz dispenses lottery tickets. (Abstract)

Regarding claim 9, for the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 9 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

Regarding claim 14, for the reasons stated below for claim 12, claim 14 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 10:** Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing units are linked (to the gaming machine) so that the combination of devices (i.e., the slot machine/lottery terminal combination) has to have a certain number of coins inserted before a ticket is dispensed. (Col. 3, line 51).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1 above, claim 10 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claims 12, 17:** Claim 12 is a combination of claims 1 and 5. Claim 17 is a subset of claim 1.

Claim 12 requires that the device count the coins the player places in the gaming machine, and show the number of counted coins to the player. As stated above and agreed on by the Examiner, that Okuniewicz does not teach this. And as stated above, there is no reason to combine and in fact it is taught away to

combine Okuniewicz and Quinn. Therefore claim 12 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

As stated above and agreed upon by the Examiner, Okuniewicz does not teach as required by Claim 17 that the number of counted coins is set to zero once a ticket is dispensed. Further for the reasons stated above, claim 17 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 15:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz teaches holding a drawing to determine a winner of said ticket.

For the reasons stated above for claim 12, claim 15 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 16:** Okuniewicz teaches the lottery ticket may be for the Big Game. In the Big Game, a bonus prize is generated from a percentage of total coins placed into all participating gaming machines (i.e., a percentage of money used to buy game tickets).

For the reasons stated above for claim 12, claim 16 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8, 11, 13, and 18 as being obvious over Okuniewicz as applied to claims 1, 12 and further in view of Castellano, 5,477,952.

**Claim 7, 13:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Both contain coin counters, but do not give details of the operation thereof. Okuniewicz bonuses a player based

on number of coins played (Col. 3, line 51) but does not teach that the numeric counter counts coin pulses off of the gaming machines hard meter. Castellano teaches that the numeric counter (12) counts coin pulses off of the gaming machines hard meter (52). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to have modified Okuniewicz and Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter count coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter in order to carry out Okuniewicz and Quinn's suggestion to count the coins entered by the player.

Claim 7 requires that the numeric counter counts coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter, and bonuses a player based on the number of coins or pulses played. Further claim 7 requires that the bonus be paid on a single gaming machine.

Castellano does not teach awarding the player a bonus based on the number of coins played. Further Castellano does not teach awarding a lottery ticket. There is no reason for combining Castellano with Okuniewicz and Quinn. Further for the reasons stated above, Claim 7 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

Regarding claim 13, the counting the coins is accomplished by counting coin pulses off of the machine's hard meter and the ticket is dispensed base on the number of coins deposited.

Castellano does not teach awarding the player a bonus based on the number of coins played. Further Castellano does not teach awarding a lottery ticket. There is no reason for combining Castellano with Okuniewicz and Quinn. Further for the reasons stated above, Claim 13 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

**Claim 8:** Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Neither specifically discloses that the numeric counter can count various coin denominations. Castellano specifically teaches that the numeric counter can count various coin denominations. (Fig 1, 21-24) Allowing players to use more than one denomination makes it convenient for the players to put more money in the slot machine. This increases profits. It would have been obvious to have modified Okuniewicz and Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter can count various denominations in order to make it convenient for the player to put more money in the slot machine.

There is no reason for combining Castellano with Okuniewicz and Quinn. Further for the reasons stated above, Claim 8 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

**Claims 11, 18:** Okuniewicz teaches that the benefit of the device is the ability to change the criteria for generating a ticket. (Col. 3, 1-9). The

LIB is a remote unit (i.e., a separate module) for changing the number of coins necessary to generate said ticket.

Castellano teaches a game machine (Col 13, 23). There is a counter for counting the number of coins a player has placed in the machine. (Col 6, 32-36) The numeric counter counts all coins placed into the gaming machine – thus it continues to count coins until a ticket is generated. There is a means (the game machine's display) for showing the player when the ticket will be printed (i.e. when the player wins the game). There is a ticket dispenser (31). Castellano teaches that there is readout for externally communicating the current coin count. (Col 6, 11-13) It is not clear, however, whether this readout is for visually displaying the number of coins to the player. This allows the player to see how many coins the player has inserted into the machine and how many are available for gambling.

Regarding claim 11 and 18, for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 12, respectively claims 11 and 18 are not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for  
allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 309316898 US

Date of Deposit: March 8, 2005


I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith  
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail  
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the  
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner  
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on  
March 8, 2005

Signature:

Name: Debbie Broderick



Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss  
Reg. No. 34,751  
Attorney for Applicant  
Weiss & Weiss  
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251  
Mineola, NY 11501  
(516) 739-1500